

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 to further clarify the invention and adds claim 11, which is clearly supported throughout the specification.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner objected to the specification and drawings. The Examiner further rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and maintained the rejection of claims 1-8 as well as rejected previously added claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**II. Specification Objections**

The specification is objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner refers to 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o), asserting that correction is required with regard to the phrase “slot-in portion is smaller than a cross-section of the cross-over portion,” as recited in claim 9.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. At least FIG. 4 of the specification provides sufficient antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of claim 9. FIG. 4 clearly shows an exemplary slot-in portion 44a being smaller in cross-section than an exemplary cross-over portion 44b. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

**III. Drawing Objections**

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed features of the “slot-in portion is smaller than a cross-section of the

cross-over portion” is not shown in the drawings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At least FIG. 4 and page 7 last line to page 8 line 13 of the specification clearly show that the slot-in portion 44a is smaller in cross-section than the cross-over portion 44b. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient written support for the feature of “slot-in portion is smaller than a cross-section of the cross-over portion” recited in claim 9.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. At least FIG. 4 and page 7 last line to page 8 line 13 of the specification provide sufficient support for the above-noted feature. FIG. 4 and the cited section of the specification clearly show that the slot-in portion 44a is smaller in cross-section than the cross-section of the cross-over portion 44b. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and Statement of Substance of the Interview

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0043886; hereinafter “Fujita”) in view of Umeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,326; hereinafter “Umeda”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least in view of the following comments.

Applicant thanks the Examiner and the Primary Examiner, Karl Tamai, for a courteous personal interview with Applicant's representatives (Nataliya Dvorson and Rohit Krishna) on December 17, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0043886) in view of Umeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,236) was discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview but possible amendments were discussed. Further to the interview, the Examiner and Primary Examiner agreed that claim 1 as now amended overcomes the rejections of record. That is, the Examiners take the position that both Fujita and Umeda disclose completely impregnating spaces between the coils with varnish. Accordingly, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest having a gap between the coating of two adjacent elements. In short, "the electrical conductor is comprised of a slot-in portion and a cross-over portion connecting each of the slot-in portions, and wherein the cross-over portion comprises at least one gap between the insulation coating of adjacent elements of the conductor," as set forth in claim 1 is not disclosed by the prior art of record.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Claims 2-10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency of claim 1.

VI. New Claims

Claim 11 is added, support for which may be found throughout the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is patentable at least by virtue of the subject matter recited therein, as acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview subject to further search and consideration.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 22, 2008